

REMARKS

Claims 36, 37, 39-44 and 52-58 are pending. Claims 10, 12-18 and 45-51 are canceled herein. Claims 36, 37, 39-44 are amended herein. Claims 52-58 are newly presented herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Rejections of Claims 13 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are moot, as these Claims have been canceled.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejections

Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Taylor, et al. ("Taylor;" US 5,536,993) in view of Kawate, et al. ("Kawate;" US 5,770,918). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Taylor in view of Kawate.

Applicants respectfully assert that Taylor does not teach, suggest or disclose "a substantially continuous barrier layer of substantially uniform thickness over said one side of said cathode structure, wherein said barrier layer is configured to prevent migration of

contaminants from said cathode structure into an active region of said field emission display device” as recited by independent Claim 36.

Taylor is completely silent with respect to methods related to contaminants. Kawate does not correct this deficiency, as Kawate is also silent with respect to methods related to contaminants.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 36 overcomes the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is not rendered obvious by Taylor in view of Kawate, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43 depend from Claim 36. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims as they depend from an allowable base claim.

Claims 36, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borel, et al. (“Borel;” US 4,857,161) in view of Kawate, et al. (“Kawate;” US 5,770,918). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 36 and 41 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Borel in view of Kawate.

Applicants respectfully assert that Borel does not teach, suggest or disclose “a substantially continuous barrier layer of substantially uniform thickness over said one side of said cathode structure, wherein said barrier layer is configured to prevent migration of

contaminants from said cathode structure into an active region of said field emission display device” as recited by independent Claim 36.

Taylor is completely silent with respect to methods related to contaminants. Kawate does not correct this deficiency, as Kawate is also silent with respect to methods related to contaminants.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 36 overcomes the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is not rendered obvious by Borel in view of Kawate, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claim 41 depends from Claim 36. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim as it depends from an allowable base claim.

Claims 36 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nokamoto, et al. (“Nokamoto;” US 5,847,496) in view of Kawate, et al. (“Kawate;” US 5,770,918). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 36 and 44 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Nokamoto in view of Kawate.

Applicants respectfully assert that Nokamoto does not teach, suggest or disclose “a substantially continuous barrier layer of substantially uniform thickness over said one side of said cathode structure, wherein said barrier layer is configured to prevent migration of contaminants from said cathode structure into an active

region of said field emission display device” as recited by independent Claim 36. Nokamoto is completely silent with respect to methods related to contaminants. Kawate does not correct this deficiency, as Kawate is also silent with respect to methods related to contaminants.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim36 overcomes the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is not rendered obvious by Nokamoto in view of Kawate, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claim 44 depends from Claim 36. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim as it depends from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 36, 37 and 39-41 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.


Applicants have reviewed the following reference which was cited but not relied upon and do not find this reference to show or suggest the present claimed invention: US 5,777,432.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 10/7/03



John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060